



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/037,757	10/18/2001	Carol T. Schembri	10004108-1	7503
7590 03/14/2005		EXAMINER		
AGILENT TECHNOLOGIES, INC.			FORMAN, BETTY J	
Legal Department, DL429 Intellectual Property Administration P.O. Box 7599 Loveland, CO 80537-0599			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1634	
			DATE MAILED: 03/14/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)
	10/037,757	SCHEMBRI ET AL.
Examiner		Art Unit
	BJ Forman	1634

	BJ Forman	1634					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appear	ars on the cover sheet with the d	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 28 January 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing d	_						
The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO							
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	` ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' '	KOT KEPLT WAS FILE					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL							
2. The reply was filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appe	eal, but prior to the date of filing ar	n appeal brief. The No	tice of Appeal				
was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 4 Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CAMENDMENTS	1.37 must be filed within two mont CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal o	hs of the date of filing of the appeal. Since a	the Notice of				
	to the second of						
 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further con (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below 	nsideration and/or search (see NO w);	TE below);					
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or			the issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	jected claims.					
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1	` '/'						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)							
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all the non-allowable claim(s).	lowable if submitted in a separate	, timely filed amendm	ent canceling				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	☑ will not be entered, or b) ☐ wilded below or appended.	ill be entered and an	explanation of				
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:	••	.·					
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-10,12-20,22-24 and 26.</u>							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	•						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	d sufficient reasons why the affida	vit or other evidence is	s necessary				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fai See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(Is to provide a 1).				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	entry is below or attac	hed.				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowa	nce because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper	No(s)					
		BJ Horman Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1634					

Continuation of 3. NOTE:

The amendment further defines the glass layer as "continuous". This further limitation has not been discussed or considered. Therefore, the amendment would require further search and consideration. Furthermore, the amendment potentially introduces new matter because the passage cited (Fig. 3 #14d, and page 14) by Applicant to support the amendment illustrates a planar surface, such as a glass slide, but the cited passage does not define or describe the full scope of the newly claimed "continuous" glass layer. Therefore, the amendment potentially adds new matter.

Applicant's arguments regarding the prior art rejections have been reviewed. The arguments address the unentered amendments. As such, the arguments are deemed moot regarding the outstanding rejections. However, it is noted that, if entered, the limitation "continuous" would not define the instant invention over the array of the prior art because, given the broadest reasonable interpretation, the arrayed beads disclosed in the WO/01/18524, appear to be a uniform/continuous layer (see e.g. Fig. 7, 13-14).

Regarding the previous rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, Applicant asserts the claimed "reference unit" is fully enabled because the definition is ties to the maximum fluorescence obtainable, or a fraction thereof, which necessarily means that one uses the Xe lamp in a manner that provides maximum fluorescence and one of skill would readily know how to operate a lamp in this manner. The argument has been considered but is not found persuasive because the arguments are merely assertions of counsel. And the courts have stated that arguments of counsel cannot take the place of evidence in the record. In re Schulze, 346 F.2d 600, 602, 145 USPQ 716, 718 (CCPA 1965). This is not to be considered an invitation to file a declaration, because a declaration after final action would not be deemed timely.

BJ FORMAN, PH.D. PRIMARY EXAMINER